

Applicant : Randall B. Lauffer et al.  
Serial No. : 09/887,706  
Filed : September 8, 2000  
Page : 5 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 13498-009002 / MET-  
7/Continuation

### REMARKS

Claims 64, 65, 67, and 71-84 were pending. The Examiner rejected claims 64, 65, 67, and 71-84. Applicants have herein amended claim 64, cancelled claims 65, 67, 71-78, and 82-84, and added claim 85. Amendments to claim 64 find support in prior claim 83 and at page 42 of the specification. New claim 85 finds support in prior claim 64. Accordingly, no new matter has been added. Thus, claims 64, 79-81, and 85 are pending.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephonic interview on September 16, 2003 to discuss the pending claims. In light of the amendments and the remarks herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 64, 79-81, and 85.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 64, 65, 67, and 71-84 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner stated that there was no structural relationship of elements making up the SDTBM.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The prior claims did provide a structural arrangement of the elements making up the SDTBM, as set forth more fully in the Response to Office Action filed May 21, 2003. In order to expedite prosecution, however, Applicants have herein amended claim 64 to recite the contrast agents set forth in prior claim 83. Chemical structures for the contrast agents can be found on page 42 of the specification. Accordingly, present claim 64 does provide essential structural relationships for the contrast agents to be used in the method.

Given the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Examiner also rejected claims 64, 65, 67, and 71-84 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner stated

Applicant : Randall B. Lauffer et al.  
Serial No. : 09/887,706  
Filed : September 8, 2000  
Page : 6 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 13498-009002 / MET-  
7/Continuation

that the specification failed to describe the SDTBM as comprising "zero to six linear or branched alkyl groups having 1 to 10 carbon atoms; zero to five cycloalkyl groups, zero to five aryl groups."

Applicants respectfully disagree. As indicated more fully in the Response to Office Action filed May 21, 2003, the specification does provide written description for the SDTBM as previously claimed. In order to expedite prosecution, however, Applicants have herein amended claim 64 to recite the contrast agents set forth in prior claim 83. Support for the structure of the contrast agents can be found at page 42 of the specification. Accordingly, present claim 64 does have adequate written description in the specification.

Given the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

#### CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 64, 79-81, and 85. The Examiner is invited to call the under-signed attorney if such would expedite prosecution.


No fees are believed due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Randall B. Lauffer et al.  
Serial No. : 09/887,706  
Filed : September 8, 2000  
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 13498-009002 / MET-  
7/Continuation

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/17/03



Teresa A. Lavoie, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 42,782

Fish & Richardson P.C., P.A.  
60 South Sixth Street  
Suite 3300  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 335-5070  
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

60158651.doc